

Earth we got 87 votes together for a farm bill, with the tremendous help of the ranking member, Senator STABENOW, it was pretty easy.

We were holding hearings, as both of the Senators know. And people asked me: How do you get something like this done?

It is just a huge undertaking. You have to listen to farmers. You have to sit on the wagon tongue and listen.

Well, this time we didn't have to sit on the wagon tongue and listen. United, they said: What on Earth is going on? How did this proposal get loose? In other words, keeping us out of the continuing resolution, given the problems that we are having, what on Earth is going on?

And so it wasn't much of a surprise to any of us when farmers—every one of them represented by the groups that the distinguished Senator has just listed—said: Whoa. Wait a minute. We are getting left out.

I think the leader in a conference said something about, well, other than the fact that we are treating agriculture and farmers like bums—I mean, it was pretty clear what was going on, and it was terribly counterproductive. I don't know how people come up with these things. It is what it is.

But we listened to farmers. We got the job done. We cooperated. It was bipartisan.

Some of the nutrition programs were addressed. It was a good news story. We couldn't have done it, however, without the 47 groups that sounded the alarm. And so we have been able to do it over a period of about 3 or 4 or 5 days.

I thank everybody concerned. I think it is a good news story in the end result.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I also want to add Terry Van Doren to that list, who is here this morning on the floor. He worked tirelessly and stood firm in the negotiations. So, Terry, thank you to you as well.

And, again, the final word, though, has to go—I think Senator BOOZMAN would agree with me—to our Ag chairman. Thanks so much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me at the outset join in with my Republican colleagues. Coming from a farm State, I am glad that we have a bipartisan continuing resolution until December 11.

I am saddened that we don't have the Appropriations Committee working through its normal process, nor the Budget Committee. This is the world we live in now—continuing resolutions. And this continuing resolution does include money for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is the usual source of payments for agriculture programs agreed to in the farm bill.

There was some question as to whether or not there was enough money in the CCC account to take care for the months to come. Now there is

no question that it will be adequately funded. That is a positive thing.

I also am happy to report that the early press reports that we saw suggesting CCC funds were actually going to be diverted to oil companies—oil companies—was expressly prohibited as part of this negotiation.

Understand what is behind this. These oil companies have benefited from a decision by the Trump administration to give small refineries waivers when it came to the blending of ethanol with their product. The net result of that decision by the Trump administration was that a large number of these small refineries were given waivers for blending, and, as a result, the actual production of ethanol declined dramatically. It is one of the major reasons that corn is grown and sold. It is for that use, and it was diminished dramatically.

It was one of major reasons why, as the ethanol industry cratered, that farm income in many States was cut in half from what it normally has been.

In just the last few days, there has been an attempt to rectify the situation, which should have been changed years ago, and rectifying it to say that, once again, there will be blending of ethanol with gasoline in the United States, which I support. And then someone suggested, well, let's give an additional subsidy to the oil companies from the Commodity Credit Corporation—a terrible idea from the start. I am glad it is not included in this final product.

Let me mention one other part of this that is included that I think bears notice, and that is the fact that there is an extension of the school feeding program for the next school year.

We have an extraordinary situation with the COVID-19 pandemic where many schools are not bringing kids into the classroom. Many of these kids are being taught online across America. I know it because I know my grandkids are going through this. For those who are in lower income-qualifying categories, we have now extended in this continuing resolution the accessibility of these school feeding programs for the next school year. That is important. Kids, if they are going to learn, have to have nutrition. We don't want them suffering from hunger in the process in any way, shape, or form in this great Nation.

I want to salute not just the CCC, which has been lauded over and over again in this last half hour, but this decision that my side of the aisle was pushing for to extend school lunch and school feeding programs into the next school year. I think it will give some peace of mind to administrators who are trying to cope with the current situation.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, on a completely different subject—but related—we have lost 200,000 Americans to coronavirus. The predictions are that by election day there could be 300,000 deaths and by the first of next year, 400,000 deaths.

My heart goes out to the families affected. I listened as spokespeople for the administration talked about the wonderful job that they have done in defending America from the coronavirus. The numbers don't back them up at all.

The United States of America has 4.5 percent of the global population, and yet as of this morning, we have 20 percent of the COVID-19 deaths in the world—4.5 percent of the population, 20 percent of the COVID-19 deaths. This great and powerful Nation, with the best doctors and hospitals and researchers and pharmaceutical companies in the world, has one of the worst records in fighting this virus in the world. It is sad to think that you are five times more likely to be infected by COVID-19 in the United States than if you were living in Germany; twice as likely to be infected by COVID-19 in the United States than if you were living in Canada. Canada, just across the border, has an infection rate half of what the United States has. What is it that they did that we didn't do?

Well, they came together as a nation with a national policy, and it worked. We didn't. This President basically said to the Governors: You are on your own. As a consequence, there was a mad scramble to get protective equipment. There was a mad scramble for ventilators. It was a free-for-all when it should have been a coordinated national policy.

Then, when the public health experts told us the obvious, that we ought to use these masks, and we should practice social distancing, washing our hands, and avoiding crowds, the President of the United States said just the opposite. One day he wore a mask—I saw on television—when he visited a veterans hospital. I don't know if he has ever worn one before or since. When the message from the public health experts who insisted that it was the best way to break the back of this pandemic, this President mocked them by holding rallies across the United States with all of his loyal fans pointedly not wearing masks to show they really didn't care—didn't care about any of the public health advice, and we are paying the price for it.

More people are infected in this country than Canada. We have double the rate here over Canada, five times the rate over Germany. So many more have died in this country who should be living today. The President, at various times, has said, when asked about the deaths: "It is what it is." That is an off-the-cuff dismissal of the issue, which is beneath the dignity of any leader of either political party.

Despite the urgent needs of families, businesses, workers, and unemployed Americans across the country, we haven't followed through on the original CARES Act, which passed in this Chamber on March 26. It was that date, by a vote of 96 to 0, that Republicans and Democrats said: We take this seriously, March 26, and we are going to

dedicate \$3 trillion to make sure that we fight this virus and that we do everything in our power to cushion the shock of the economic impact of this virus on America.

I went home after that, and people said: I can't believe 96 to nothing. Democrats and Republicans agreed? Well, we did. There were some proposals in there that were brandnew, such as the Paycheck Protection Program that Senators RUBIO and CARDIN constructed. I think I have been told they spent perhaps 2 weeks in writing this important program. Was it perfect? By no means. We realized, after a few weeks, it needed to be changed, and we changed it several times, but the concept was sound to give money to small businesses so they could keep people on the payroll, pay the mortgage, pay the rent, pay the utilities. These are the fundamentals that a business needed so that it might reopen and put people back to work. It was a great program. It should be extended even further. I think there should be a second round.

I also think there should be a second round when it comes to unemployment benefits. The \$600 a week, which we provided—which is incidentally subject to taxation, people should remember—but the \$600 a week which we provided over and above State benefits made a dramatic difference in the lives of Americans. Critics from the outset said: It is going to make people lazy. Folks will just sit at home watching Netflix and eating bonbons.

I don't believe that. In fact, when you look at the reality of the situation, 70 percent of the people who have gone back to work in America—70 percent of them—were earning less money at work than they did with unemployment benefits, and yet they went back to work. Why would they do that if it were just about whether you are going to be lazy or thrifty? It is because they want to be back to work for the benefits, to do the work that they do and enjoy doing, and they knew that unemployment was a temporary thing, as it should be, as people had an opportunity to return.

So that expired July 31. The President has tried to extend it by Executive order. There is question as to whether he has the authority to do that. The President is also trying to do something which I still don't understand how to explain to anyone when it comes to payroll tax. He is allowing employers to decide whether to suspend collection of the payroll tax to a later date. If that tax on your income of 6 percent or 7 percent is suspended, but yet you have to pay it all back at the beginning of the year, are Americans prepared to have a double taxation from their payroll check after the first of the year? In the meantime, that payroll tax is supposed to be used to fund Social Security and Medicare. If the President is not funding Social Security and Medicare, what does that do to the solvency and longevity of

those programs? It raises a question as to whether they are going to be hurt by this temporary measure. It is a very confusing proposal by the President, but he has put it on the table, and we are now trying to sort out the impact it is going to have.

We need to do more. We shouldn't go home for this election empty handed when it comes to helping the families and businesses across America, and we need to start to help State and local governments.

My State of Illinois has problems—plenty of them. When it comes to pensions, for example, just like Kentucky, we have problems funding our pensions in Illinois. But we have a second set of problems created by the pandemic—the downturn in revenue which is going to have a dramatic impact on State budgets in Illinois and other States. If we don't help these State and local governments get through this problem, they have no choice but to layoff important, vital employees—law enforcement, firefighters, healthcare—just to name a few.

When people talk about defunding the police, I am afraid that if we don't give a helping hand to State and local governments, we are actually going to see the defunding of some law enforcement across this country. That is why those on this side of the aisle have been pushing for State and local assistance as part of any package of relief that we pass.

The majority leader knows this needs to be done. The playbook was right in front of him for another relief bill. We did it back in March with the CARES Act. To negotiate a real package with real solutions for the American people, the majority leader needs to show up at the negotiating table. It is impossible to explain why Senator MCCONNELL boycotted the negotiation sessions between the White House and the Democratic leaders in Congress. There was an empty chair waiting for him, but he never filled it.

I am introducing legislation this week to help workers who have been furloughed or laid off through the pandemic from losing their health insurance. I can't imagine a worse situation than in the midst of a public health crisis to lose your health insurance coverage.

If you have been laid off, your options are a few—but only a few. You may qualify for Medicaid. It is possible. You might go to the Affordable Care Act and go on the exchange and find an insurance policy that works for you and your family. There is also an option called COBRA, where you would take the health insurance offered in your workplace and decide to keep it but pay the employer's share as well as the employee's share on premiums. The problem, of course, is that it is very expensive.

On average, COBRA costs \$600 a month to keep the health insurance you had at work for an individual, \$1,700 a month for a family. Six hun-

dred dollars a week sounds like a lot of money—times 4 weeks, \$2,400. But if \$1,700 a month is going just to maintain your health insurance from where you worked, you can see there is virtually no benefit. It is estimated that 23 million workers can lose health coverage during the course of this pandemic. That happens to just about mirror the number who were given health insurance under the Affordable Care Act. Now they stand to lose—at least the same number stand to lose their health insurance because of the pandemic. Are we going to sit still for this or are we going to help these families?

My bill, which I will be introducing with Senator CORTEZ MASTO and others, will fully cover the cost of COBRA, enabling newly unemployed Americans to keep their healthcare coverage during this difficult time. The legislation mirrors what passed in the Heroes Act in the House in May—in May, 4 months ago—and it is vital to help those whose jobs have been taken away by the pandemic. We have waited 4 months to do something here in the Senate, and we have done nothing.

So MCCONNELL brought a bill up 2 weeks ago that is so thin and so wanting that it really didn't address the problems that this Nation faces.

There is a new report from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation that half of Chicago households report having lost their jobs. Some of those who lost their job are head of household, have been furloughed or are seeing reductions in wages or hours since the start of the pandemic. Half—half—of Chicago's households reported facing serious financial problems during the pandemic and have trouble caring for their children. Thirty-five percent reported that they used up all or most of their savings. This is a terrible situation—a challenging situation. We owe it to this country and the people we represent not to ignore it.

As we know, the pandemic has disproportionately affected our minority communities, with nearly 70 percent of Black families and 63 percent of Latinx families in Chicago reporting they are having serious financial problems—70 percent of Black families, 63 percent of Latinx families.

While those statistics reflect the reality of many in Chicago, there is no doubt that this is also the story in many other cities across this Nation.

That is why we need a Federal response. We need to do what is necessary to help these families, businesses, cities, and States get back on their feet. But instead, the Senate Republicans proposed an inadequate, partisan bill, with no negotiations with the other side of the aisle. They failed to prioritize the needs of struggling families.

The bill has failed to provide another round of economic impact pay for families or hazard pay for essential workers. They fail to provide relief to States and local governments to help teachers, EMTs, firefighters, and police.

A week from Thursday is October 1, which means another month's rent will be due, and many families know they will not be able to pay it. We need help on a bipartisan basis. I agree with Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell, if we don't move and move quickly to address this issue, the economy can sink even deeper, and recovery would be further in the distance. In the meantime, the death numbers in the United States would be even worse.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John Charles Hinderaker, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

Mitch McConnell, Martha McSally, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker, John Cornyn, Lamar Alexander, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, Marco Rubio, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Rob Portman, Kevin Cramer, John Thune, Steve Daines, John Boozman, James Lankford.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of John Charles Hinderaker, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 71, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 190 Ex.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Baldwin	Fischer	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Booker	Grassley	Peters
Brown	Hassan	Portman
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Reed
Cantwell	Inhofe	Risch
Cardin	Jones	Roberts
Carper	Kaine	Romney
Casey	King	Rosen
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Rubio
Collins	Leahy	Sanders
Coons	Loeffler	Schatz
Cornyn	Manchin	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Shelby
Cramer	McConnell	Sinema
Crapo	McSally	Smith
Duckworth	Menendez	Stabenow
Durbin	Merkley	Tester
Ernst	Murkowski	Tillis

Toomey	Warner	Wicker
Udall	Warren	Wyden
Van Hollen	Whitehouse	

NAYS—26

Barrasso	Gardner	Rounds
Blackburn	Hawley	Sasse
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Boozman	Hirono	Scott (FL)
Braun	Hoeben	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Young
Enzi	Moran	

NOT VOTING—3

Capito	Harris	Johnson
--------	--------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 71, the nays are 26.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Idaho.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, fellow Senators, I rise today in honor of and to speak about the importance of small businesses—in particular, in relation to National Small Business Week.

Idaho's small businesses are the engine that powers our State's economy. They provide us with not only goods and services, local jobs, and growth opportunities, but also immeasurable community value.

With the onset and spread of COVID-19, this year has presented Idaho's business owners with challenges not seen in our lifetime. Even under normal circumstances, business ownership takes remarkable courage and commitment. With the pandemic, the challenges associated with entrepreneurship have increased dramatically. Throughout 2020, Idaho's small businesses have shown tremendous determination as they have strived to serve their customers and keep their doors open to people in their communities.

During this year's National Small Business Week, I want to take this opportunity to recognize the resilience and courage of small businesses throughout the Gem State and encourage Idahoans to continue to support the local shops, restaurants, and businesses that make our communities vibrant.

I firmly believe that small business relief is a shared, bipartisan priority. Here in the Senate, we will continue to work to deliver relief to Idaho's small businesses so that we can get back on the path to recapturing the unprecedented prosperity our economy provided before this crisis began.

Idahoans are set apart by their grit, self-reliance, and their deep commitment to community. I am constantly reminded of this and proud of it when I see Idaho's small businesses enduring and supporting one another through these uncertain times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

SUPREME COURT NOMINATIONS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. Justice Ginsburg was a role model for many and a champion for all, and I was one of those.

I would like to speak about what is at stake for the American public with

this vacancy on the Court and why whoever is elected President in November should be the one who decides to fill this seat.

Justice Ginsburg was, simply put, a phenomenal lawyer and jurist. She was small, and she was mighty. As a civil rights lawyer, she won key cases that established a woman's constitutional right to equal treatment and confirmed the principle of equal rights for all. As a jurist, she further cemented these key principles into law. She brought them up, and she made them exist forever.

As a person, she brought smiles to our faces, and now she really does bring tears.

Although small in stature, Ruth Bader Ginsburg was a formidable advocate, strategist, and champion. I believe she will continue to serve as a major role model for generations of women, both young and old, for whom she paved the way, and I am one of those. We are in her debt today, and generations to come will be in her debt as well.

Justice Ginsburg is also important to me personally. Her confirmation hearing was the first I participated in as a newly elected Senator and as the first woman to sit on the Judiciary Committee in 1993. It was a long time ago.

As I said before the committee in 1993, it was not until I began preparing for Justice Ginsburg's confirmation that I learned how she built the foundation for women's rights. Simply put, it was this: Before becoming a judge on the DC Circuit, Justice Ginsburg was the director of the ACLU's Women's Rights Project, where she won five cases before the Supreme Court. Amazing—five cases before people believed women had these rights. In one of these cases, *Craig v. Boren*, the Supreme Court held for the first time that the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment applied to women. Can you believe it—actually applied to women. This is a very big addition because this really canceled out inequality.

In other words, it is because of Justice Ginsburg's advocacy as a lawyer that the government cannot discriminate against women on the basis of sex. For the female side of this room, this was really a major person whose works enabled us to run for this esteemed body and be part of it.

It is no surprise, then, that Justice Ginsburg remained a fierce defender of women from the bench.

She consistently reaffirmed a woman's right to choose and upheld *Roe v. Wade* against dozens of attacks.

She invalidated the men's-only policy at the Virginia Military Institute. Explaining that decision at a visit to VMI, Justice Ginsburg told cadets that she knew it "would make V.M.I. a better place."

In 2007, she vehemently dissented in a case where the Court's majority held that a woman—namely, one Lilly Ledbetter, with whom we have become familiar—was time-barred from suing